DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 388 CS 503 161

AUTHOR Korzenny, Felipe: And Others
TITLE Teaching Intercultural Communication in the 1980's: Philosophy, Methods, and Evaluation Research.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 35p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (66th, New York, NY, November 13-16, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cross Cultural Training: *Curriculum Development: Educational Change: Educational Philosophy: Higher Education: *Interpersonal Relationship: Research Needs: Speech Communication: *Speech Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS *Intercultural Communication

ABSTRACT

The teaching of intercultural communication has been characterized by a lack of a general paradigm for research: consequently, most texts are a potpourri of trends. The types of information that ought to be summarized and integrated into a coherent frame of reference are in the intrapersonal-interpersonal areas, group communication, and mass communication. As a result of the new world order, courses should pull evidence and thought together to provide the learner with a balanced view of today's world in which communication is a two-way process. In order to expand the teaching of intercultural communication in the 1980s, consideration must be given to the type of student that can be taught (including the nontraditional) and the end goals for teaching intercultural communication. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197388

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TEACHING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN THE 1980's:

PHILOSOPHY, METHODS, AND EVALUATION RESEARCH

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Felipe Korzenny
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Felipe Korzenny, Kimberly Neuendorf and Betty Ann Griffis
Department of Communication
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Justin Morrill Inter-College Programs
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New York City, November 13-16, 1980.

CS503161

TEACHING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN THE 1980's: PHILOSOPHY, METHODS, AND EVALUATION RESEARCH

There has been a lot written, and a lot of thought given to the topic of teaching Intercultural Communication. On this occasion, the topic is not only teaching, but teaching in the 80's. The first question that comes to mind is: didn't we have enough trouble teaching in the 70's? Yes, we had trouble and our discipline had not reached puberty yet. Now we are facing the problems of adolescence. In the 70's we were in transition, we were in a stage of mixed feelings regarding international issues, and more mixed regarding intercultural ones in the U.S. In the 1970's we faced the end of the Vietnam war, we faced oil embargos and we faced the advocacy of a new international information order. Now, in the 80's we face similar problems and more. We now actually confront the development of a new international information and economic order, accompanied by a new set of international relations for which a resolution is still to be clarified. We are in a period of transition, a period of reflection and self evaluation. Some questions we may want to ask ourselves are: What have we taught our students? Have we taught them to be more effective in confronting intercultural interactions? Have we taught them to respect others for what they are? Have we taught them to be more sensitive to verbal and nonverbal cues which would allow us to more easily get away with what we want? Have we taught them that racism and ethnocentrism are to be overcome? Have we taught them to be prepared to face culture shock?

Perhaps we have done all that within a wide variety of philosophical orientations. However, our knowledge about cultural communication is so scant. Our knowledge is rudimentary and our philosophy of action is still doubtful. We are experiencing growing pains.

In this presentation we will try to point to three main aspects which we believe deserve special attention when teaching intercultural communication: philosophy, methods, and evaluation.

Philosophy for action:

1. The first thing that I propose we consider in this context is the painful fact that our teaching has been characterized by a lack of a general paradigm for research. We have no guidelines and no background that in a systematic manner lead us to the formalization of teaching.

Also, we have no conceptual schemes or theories based on empirical research. Suffice it to say that the most recent books in the field are still a potpourri of trends. Most texts contain research ideas with relatively little empirical substantiation. These texts are still mostly composed of a set of speculative ideas about what different individuals with some bright insights have said. We are still to see the scholar who dedicates a couple of years (and parenthetically let me say: the funding agency that sponsors those years) of synthesizing work to come up with a general set of statements based on what there is to guide future inquiry. Larry Sarbaugh's book Intercultural Communication is a step in the right direction. Sarbaugh does provide us with a set of generalizations but with very little systematic search of what there is and with less empirical evidence supporting his propositions. Prosser's Cultural Dialogue is another recent attempt in the direction of synthesizing, but it happens to talk about

everything without concentrating on specific trends of research. There is more than these two recent bibliographical trials. I could continue enumerating them but I will not. Enough book reviews have been published lately.

As teachers our mission is to give our students the guiding light of what our research has found. How many of us really use current research to guide the cognitions, attitudes and behaviors of our students? Perhaps a handful. But this handful may have done so despite what is available not because of the merits of existing materials. After consideration of state of the art reviews, and the shared experiences of many of us, I believe we have promulgated untested beliefs. So, this is the first principle for action: Let's do research!

Ladies and gentlemen, the next best seller in the field of intercultural communication, it is my prediction, will be the text which summarizes research trends and results. In communication we have already conducted some research, and a lot more is to be found across a wide variety of disciplines.

The types of information which ought to be summarized and integrated into a coherent frame of reference are in the intra-interpersonal areas, group communication area, and mass communication. Especially interesting is the latter in having distinguished itself by having provided the field with provocative ideas such as: cultural imperialism, cultural dependence, and the implications of a new information order. However, and reflecting the overall state of our discipline, only a handful of research pieces have provided any evidence for what such trends advocate (e.g., Barnett and McPhail's piece in the last issue of IJIR.)

Further, students in cross-cultural communication courses should not only be taught. The 80's will certainly require more sophistication than the utilization of recipies learned in a course. Students who will be utilizers of research results should also know how their knowledge is generated. Students in inter/cross-cultural communication courses should be encouraged to conduct research themselves with the ultimate goal in mind of generating knowledge for students' own consumption. If every course on intercultural communication resulted in one piece of research, our knowledge base would tremendously expand. Also, students can only be sophisticated consumers of information when they have developed the critical ability to evaluate it.

2. Another crucial issue resides in the following proposition: A new world order is emerging where interaction is required for survival. Granted is that this proposition contains an untested and perhaps untestable assumption, i.e., that interaction leads to survival.

Past experiences in teaching intercultural communication, especially in the past decade, seem to indicate that the main aspect addressed in those courses was to enable individuals to better communicate. However, I believe that the word <u>better</u> seemed to imply a model of paternalism, in which I, the intercultural communicator, understand those guys out there and am able to persuade them to act in my best interest. After all, why should I exert effort in communicating if it isn't to obtain my deserved reward of sales and prominence in the international field? The diffusion of innovations paradigm tended to endorse such view quite openly. The critical and revisionist school of communication, predominant in Latin America and Europe, has isolated the

diffusionist perspective for failing to look at its own assumptions, e.g., that the source's message is beneficial for the audience, that benefits trickle down through the social structure, etc..

Also, international developments in diplomacy and commerce have pointed to a true new economic order. Such developments have had a presumed impact on the way in which U.S. Americans see themselves. For a long time, Americans felt proud of saying "we are the most powerful country on this planet!" The pride was substantiated by facts and it fostered a condescending attitude toward those less developed countries around the earth. Now, in the political scene we tend to observe more and more concern regarding the loss of U.S. power. Two possible effects of this loss of power are: 1. We may observe an increased sense of chauvinism and ethnocentrism which may help Americans protect their collective ego; and 2. There is the possibility of approaching a new international economic order with a more mature sense of understanding and with a decided attitude toward collaboration to build a better world for all of us. This second alternative does not necessarily preclude U.S. strife toward excellence in any area. I am afraid to admit that the first option seems more likely if nothing is done. The second alternative is what we, as teachers, have to try to encourage, in my opinion. When the options are destruction or dialogue and moderation, prevalent values dictate that the second option is better, especially when destruction may include all of us.

Intercultural communication courses, then, ought to pull evidence and thought together, to provide the learner, at all educational levels, with a balanced view of today's world in which communication is a two way process where a zero sum game is precluded. The motto ought to be "through cooper-

ation we will all benefit." We share a common goal. The paternalistic one-sided view of the process, is still a dangerous alternative, because the other side of the interaction is not necessarily aware of our intention. So, what our mission might be is to learn to be sensitive to cultural others, but also to encourage and teach others to be sensitive to us in the international and the multicultural domestic arenas. If anything, our mission is to train individuals to be culturally sensitive and communicatively effective while at the same time they, our students, should be carriers of a new message, a metamessage to encourage dialogue. A new mode of cultural proselitism consisting of the requirement of mutual willingness to understand. Perhaps, a la E.T. Hall, going beyond culture and encouraging others to do the same.

3. Another issue that must be considered in our teaching is that given demographic and lifestyle trends, lifelong education is now more prevalent than ever. So, our courses should reflect an openness to non-traditional students who will carry the message of the dialogue beyond culture. To open such a course means to make it relevant to the life cycle stage in which different individuals who take a course may be at.

Some educational methods may not be particularly well suited to convey the course message to individuals who have been out of formal schooling for years. To preclude them from enrolling in traditional sequences of study would result in impoverishment of traditional classes, since their experience and concerns wouldn't be available to us. Also, it is refreshing and challenging for students of all ages to interact, mix and find more universal common denominators of interest in the intercultural communication field.

Betty Ann Griffis will explore methods for meeting this challenge in the second section of this paper.

4. A fourth principle for action is: Clear cut objectives should be incorporated in courses taught. The more we refine the specification of our objectives the more likely we are to be able to know whether we have achieved them or not. To make people more aware is not necessarily a measurable objective. We should strive to specify what it is that the student is asked to learn in the course. If the cognitive component is the only aspect that concerns us, then let's make it explicit. If however, we expect that our students will become better intercultural communicators we should provide them with the opportunity to communicate and such communication should be evaluated according to specified criteria. An attempt at measuring other than cognitive gains from a course will be related to you by Kim Neuendorf in the third section of this paper. To evaluate, may not necessarily mean to assign grades. Evaluation is the measurement of the degree to which an objective has been achieved. Students do not necessarily need to be graded on papers they submit. Anonymous papers and exams could do the job in telling the instructor whether certain objectives are being met. Other types of formal evaluation may still be necessary, however.

5. The last principle for action to be here advocated is: In our field it seems that there has been a divorce between advocates of scientific research and those who advocate humanistic approaches to intercultural communication. I think that we are wasting our time. For those of us who do research, let's continue and let's open the dialogue with those who are not interested in empirical research to learn about ideas on which we can do research. On the other hand, those who have not embraced empirical approaches

to knowledge, open your arms to welcome another type of knowledge, since openness is one of the virtues we advocate as a prerequisite for our very discipline of interest.

The agenda thus suggested is to generate knowledge by two means: creation and synthesis, or research and theory building. Also, it is recommended that we reestablish our position in the world to be congruent with social and economic structures as they now emerge, i.e., to strive for a common goal. Finally, the agenda tells us to be clear in what we teach, and open in our receptiveness and accommodation to students and ways of thinking. This is my teaching agenda for the 80's; I hope you share it with me.

Methods

When asked to write on the title 'Teaching Intercultural Communication in the 1980's: Methods', I felt stimulated and excited. I pulled books and journals from my collection, borrowed from colleagues, got encyclopedia volumes from the library and immersed myself in the literature for several days. The wealth of information available only in what I had collected on teaching methods made me feel that whatever an educator might want to choose as a learning activity had either been already described or the method for its development clarified.

I put my books to the side and decided on the goal for this paper. I want to shake loose the cultural biases attached to its title so that we, as educators in intercultural communication, may have a new sense of freedom in the breadth of methodology which may serve our purposes. In order to do this I suggest a process of examination of the meaning of teaching inter-

cultural communication. My aim in this process is to expand our sense of who we are collectively as a field and the importance of our mission in the 1980's.

Let us look at the cultural biases attached to teaching intercultural communication in the present. What is the most common practice and stereotypic way of teaching in our field? What comes to mind is a graduate class in a university (perhaps, but less likely, an undergraduate class) which typically has the professor lecturing from the front of the room, the course organization outlined in a syllabus, broad goals stated with a series of difficult to measure objectives, heavy dependence on cognitive learning and perhaps a few experimental activities added to make the course look up to date. Others might stretch the concept of the field to include high school language teaching and the information given in such courses regarding the culture in which the language being studied is spoken. Some individuals might consider that training of the employee if government or international business for overseas assignments is in the field of teaching intercultural communication.

To me this is a pitifully narrow interpretation of our role. Former U.S. Senator William Fulbright described us in the U.S. as "tongue-tied", "our linguistic and cultural myopia is losing us friends, business and respect in the world". (Fulbright, 1979). Edward Hall in Beyond Culture speaks of the crises in the world of contemporary man, especially the crisis of "his relationship to himself, to his extensions, his institutions, his ideas, to those around him, as well as between the many groups that inhabit the globe, in a work, his relationship to his culture." He concludes that what is called for is a "massive cultural literacy movement". (Hall, 1977, p. 7). In

addition a tendency toward increased ethnocentrism in the face of a new economic world order as opposed to the needs of communicating interculturally cited above, points toward the vital importance of our field in the upcoming decade.

In order to expand our vision of teaching intercultural communication in the 1980's let us move from the present narrow interpretation through a process consisting of examining: (1) who we might be as educators, (2) who our students might be, and (3) what might be our end goals for teaching. I believe that looking at each of these essential components in a broader frame work will expand our field's repertoire of teaching methods. I also contend that careful attention to each of these components by groups and individuals in the field will increase our capability of choosing appropriate methodology for the learning situation identified.

I will not attempt in this paper to detail methods for those of us who will be teaching intercultural communication in the 1980's. As the three parts of the process I suggest are expanded the presumptuousness of undertaking such a task will become evident. For the rational procedure involved in instructional design including methods choice, I suggest Principles of Instructional Design (Gagne and Briggs, 1974). The authors discuss the external conditions to bring about desired learning, both the events and the choice of appropriate media employed to promote learning. Ethridge (1976) discusses methods in relation to adult learning and includes a list of 23 examples. While the examples are limited for the needs of our field, the process of methods choice for adults appears useful. Kohls and Ax (1979) have included a wider variety of methodologies. In making methods choices, I suggest combining a process oriented overview such as Gagne and Briggs (1974),

or Knowles (1977) with a practical repertoire of methodologies such as Kohls and Ax (1979) as well as devising ones own geared to the unique demands of the teaching situation. For the purposes of this paper, this will be the limit of my discussion on specific methods choices.

The following is my interpretation of the suggested three part process for expanding our field of teaching intercultural communication in the 1980's: (1) Who might be the educators of Intercultural Communication in 1980's.

In order to open up our notion of who educators might be let us consider that in teaching intercultural communication we make the assumption that to enhance intercultural communication is a value and that the development of related skills is of value to our society. I believe that we would also agree with Senator Fulbright (1979) that these skills are not widely present. If we set a goal to increase both the valuing of intercultural communication and the skills for it broadly in our culture, we might take a systems approach to think about who might be the educators. Consistent with a systems approach, we will look at this problem in terms of the various units affected by it.

I will use a theoretical model from sociologist Neil Smelser (1963) to stimulate thinking on who future teachers might be. An overview of this model will give us a clearer idea of the individual educator and the various societal levels in which she/he may be operating. Knowing who we are from this perspective will radically expand our self-concept as a field: who we are as teachers, our prospective students, and our future goals.

Societal levels as determinants of who we are in teaching intercultural communication

(A) The individual level.

At the most specific level of social structure we may consider teaching from the individual perspective. We may instruct ourselves or others as lone units, generating our own directions without feeling a part of any other societal unit in this endeavor.

(B) The collectivities level.

At the next level we may consider ourselves as teachers within the collectivities in which people live and work such as families, firms, and schools.

(C) The institutional level.

On an even more general level we may teach within or initiate teaching from the major functional complexes of the society such as the government, the educational system, or the economy.

(D) The values level.

Next we may think of oursleves as teachers within the broad structure of our society, affecting its overall pattern and value structure.

(E) The global level.

Finally, we may consider teaching from a global perspective thinking on the level of world systems such as the U.N. or trans-national business organizations.

I maintain that as a field we must think of oursleves as intercultural communication educators on all of these levels. There is some indication that intercultural education is receiving national attention. The 1980 U.S. budget for education allocates up to $80 million by 1985 for International education. We could brainstorm on intercultural teaching directions from all of these levels to generate new directions for the 1980's. Tying the levels together in an integrated and systematic societal approach toward

education for intercultural communication would take us even farther. Certainly we would move a long way from the stereotypic view we have created in the initial stages of the development of our field.

(2) Who might our students of intercultural communication be in the 1980's

I will approach this question from two aspects: first, from what groups within our society our students might come and second, from the point of view of knowing sensitively who they are as individuals.

As the developer of a series of workshops on applied aspects of intercultural training for a 1980 conference, I was fascinated by the variety of situations in which intercultural education and training has been used. However, when I considered the target audience to include a broad number in this nation I realized how far from a strong societal impact we remain.

Let us consider intercultural communication teaching from a lifelong perspective. There is an indication in 1980 Education budget that this is a national goal with funding for language and intercultural understanding instruction reaching down from the graduate level to the grade schools. I would like to suggest the addition of the non-traditional student, an adult who has already assumed major life roles within society other than being a student. Teaching intercultural communication has so far been limited to very specific adult groups. These have usually been adults participating in training for designated professional roles in an overseas setting. I suggest expanding adult education in intercultural communication to include a much wider segment of the adult population. In so doing those in the age group making crucial societal decisions as well as in charge of the early socialization of children would as stated in the philosophy section of this

paper "have a more mature sense of understanding aiming at collaboration (with other cultures) to build a better world for all of us."

Another limitation on the target audience for intercultural communication education is one which also applies in this country to adult education in general. Patricia Cross (1980) wrote; "Today's adult learners are disproportionately young, white, well educated, employed in professional and technical occupations, and making good incomes". With intercultural teaching and training targeted at higher education classrooms or those employed by organizations as professionals working with other cultures, surely the same description must apply. This means that intercultural education is elitist, available to a few selected groups to the exclusion of the bulk of members of this society. Surely in a democratic society to exclude the largest segment from a type of education which we, as a field, have stated as a value, is a grave oversight.

Another way of looking at students which will have an impact on teaching methods is giving careful attention to who they are as individuals. Assessing the needs and interests of students so that our instructional methods are relevant is for the intercultural teacher the role modeling of the behavior she/he will try to encourage as part of intercultural communication.

One area in which we might raise our sensitivities as educators is to the developmental stage of our students. If we consider the developmental period of our students we may use a methodology relevant to the developmental tasks of the individuals concerned. This would lend relevance to the programs we develop for students of all ages, prompting them to transfer from the teaching situation to real life events the concepts around which we organize our instruction.

As we include students from new and different segments of our society it will be necessary for us to know as closely as possible who they are. Differences in income levels, ethnic groups, age groups, sexes will affect our instructional design. In order to increase our awareness, we will have to find ways to learn about their needs and interests. This changes the focus from us as teachers and the act of teaching toward the students as learners with the concern for learning.

(3) What might our goals be in teaching intercultural communication in the 1980's

In the previous section on philosophy on overall mission for teaching intercultural communication was stated: "to train individuals to be culturally sensitive and communicatively effective while at the same time they should be carriers of a new message, a metamessage to encourage dialogue". I concur with this statement and would like to carry it further as we expand the notion of our field in the 1980's.

In section (1) of this methods section, I referred to levels of societal organization as affecting who teachers might be. From each of these levels goals for the teaching of intercultural communication might also be developed. At the individual level a teacher of intercultural communication might aim at increasing one person's communicative effectiveness. For example, this could be the teaching of the head of a social service agency dealing with multiethnic groups to be more sensitive to the concerns of the people served and to communicate with them so that mutual exchange of ideas was the outcome.

On the level of collectivities, teachers in our field might set about the interpretation of our main mission by teaching not only groups in formal

educational settings, but in churches, work setting, clubs, travel groups. Each of these settings would suggest different goals.

In my opinion our main goal has been greatly neglected on the institutional level. At this societal level the teaching of intercultural communication is capable of reinforcing learning taking place at less general levels. It could also strongly affect the value adaptation of our goal at the value level of the whole culture as well as encouraging it at the global level. Conversely teaching intercultural communication on one level without teaching it on another may adversely affect its outcome. This has been pointed out by Griffis (1979) In the case of multinational corporations who train their overseas employees for overseas service but then fail to support them with company policies of similar cultural sensitivity. A similar concern for multi-level training goals holds true in the case of government agencies and individual employees sent overseas as well as national foreign policy and individual citizens.

I have mentioned in this discussion that the teaching of intercultural communication implies a value, one to which we are committed as a field. In the present reaction to a change in the economic order there seems to be abundant evidence of a resurgence of ethnocentrism. Changing this drift might be a goal of our field for the 1980's. This value level will be one of the most difficult for us. It will involve an orchestration of efforts on all the previously mentioned levels of teaching, must include an expanded view of students, and will involve a wide range of methods.

Finally at the global level, trans-national goals are inherent in the very subject matter of our field. In order to be successful as teachers of intercultural communication our students must be effective on a transnational

level, no matter how minor their roles may seem. Whether they are minor cogs choosing leaders of a collectivity which will set international policy, or directly involved in an intercultural dialogue they will affect the global nature of intercultural communication. As a field our global goals might also include consideration of the various networks which span the world such as the U.N., business organizations, and scientific fields of study.

In section (2) discussing who might be our students I began to broaden our target groups to include various educational levels, age groups, economic groups, and ethnic groups. We could all easily expand these limited suggestions by looking at the various structural levels of our society. For any one of these groups, goals appropriate to our wider mission of the field may be articulated. These goals may be defined according to the cultural frame work of the particular group with a sensitivity to their common backgrounds. Likewise, teaching intercultural communication for that group may have subgoals relating to the various structural levels of society at which the teaching is taking place. For example teaching intercultural communication skills to improve communication between the growing Hispanic-American population and other ethnic groups might have goals on the less general collectivity level such as schools and churches; the institutional level of government policy-making bodies; and ultimatley the values level for attitudinal changes is the broader society. The goals would be different in these programs, but the sectors of the population aimed at the same. The particular characteristics of the groups involved would shape the setting of appropriate goals.

This past summer I got caught in a tropical storm in the Carribean. Our small canoe piloted by its Kuna Indian owner took in a tremendous wave from the back. There was no choice but to obey his command to jump. Swimming for

the nearest island and almost drowning in that powerful sea has given me an imagery for situations which seem overwhelming. Discussing methods for intercultural communication in the 1980's impressed me as such.

There are many possibilities in the choice of methods. I suggested literature resources which look at methods in terms of the process of instructional design as well as sources listing specific methods. I also suggested creating our own methods.

My chief concern in this article has been in opening up the breadth of methodology used in our field by the process of examining (1) who we might be as educators, (2) who might be our students, and (3) what might be our goals. I believe that through this process we can move from the present narrow interpretation of our field and its methods to a fresher and more creative methodology in the 1980's.

In addition to increasing the breadth of methods used by the field, I proposed the three part examination process so that individual educators might think through each component. My aim was to help individual educators to develop a sharper focus on how they see their teaching situation for the 1980's as well as their relationship to the field. I believe that more appropriate choices of methodology will result from this process. While the breadth of methodology within the sea of choice may have been enlarged through this process, the articulation by individuals of their options within it provides a saving mechanism.

I think our field has passed from the adolescent discovery period of becoming accepted full members of our society. It is both sobering and impressive to realize the importance of the field's adult identity in our society and the world. In an evolutionary sense the relevance of our society

and its continued existence may rest on our mission as teachers of intercultural communication. On the global level the communication of our mission across cultures may affect the future existence of human life.

Let us as teachers of intercultural communication broaden our ideas in the 1980's of who we are, whom we will teach, and what are our goals. Let us be flexible, multidisciplinary and creative in our choice of teaching methods. At the same time let us be concerned with clarifying our roles and creating a structure for mutual cooperation between the various applications of teaching within our field. It is my contention that with a more creative interpretation of our field, set loose from the limited view of the moment, our impact on the next decade will be considerable.

Evaluation Research in the 1980's

Traditionally, evaluation in intercultural communication education has meant simply tests of knowledge: exams, research papers, and other tests of learning. Such techniques measure knowledge gain, but do little to evaluate any application of this knowledge. They do not indicate whether the student actually believes this material he/she has memorized. They do not indicate any sensitization to intercultural situations which has hopefully occurred. They do not indicate any attitudinal or behavioral change on the part of the student.

The traditional testing techniques do meet the needs of the traditional educational goal of knowledge gain. However, a sensitization to intercultural communication problems is vital to effective communication; such sensitization will manifest itself in attitudes and behaviors rather than knowledge. This sensitization will be recognized more and more as an important outcome of intercultural communication education in the 1980's. What I am proposing is

that explicit goals of attitude and behavior change may be appropriate additions to educational goals for intercultural communication courses in the 1980's.

Evaluation techniques should include, then, measures of knowledge, of attitudes, and of behavior. Administered at several points in time, an evaluative instrument may show the changes in and development of both knowledge and attitudinal/behavioral sensitization in the students. The ultimate dependent variables in this model of intercultural communication evaluation are the measures of knowledge, attitude, and behavior which are final outcomes of the course under evaluation.

The specific evaluation measures constructed should tap the changes in certain variables or attributes which are explicit goals of the educational process. In some instances, this will mean an emphasis on behavioral outcomes of the course; in other instances, it will mean an emphasis on the more difficult to measure attitudinal outcomes. What is most important is that evaluation research allows us to examine all outcomes of intercultural communication education, rather than solely knowledge gain.

Evaluation research techniques are not well developed. One may get an idea of how evaluation research may be conducted by examining a small-scale study which attempted to evaluate cognitive, affective, and behavioral changes in an intercultural education setting.

In the spring of 1979, an undergraduate seminar in intercultural communication was held by the Department of Communication, Michigan State University. The title of the seminar was "Similarity or Dissimilarity? The Question of of Intercultural Communication," and nearly 50 undergraduate students attended the twice-weekly course. Two of the authors (i.e. Korzenny and Neuendorf)

were the instructors for the course, with the assistance of an undergraduate teaching assistant. The overall stated objectives of the course were as follows: To sensitize undergraduate students to problems that emerge in communication encounters with members of different cultures, to explore the principles and techniques that can be used in overcoming those communication problems, and to introduce the students to some of the most prevalent topics in the available literature.

As both knowledge gain and a sensitization to intercultural communication problems were desired outcomes for the students, traditional lecture and testing techniques were supplemented with more experiential types of activities. To fulfill this sensitization function, the seminar was designed as an active course, including readings, games, simulations, exercises, films, and out-of-class intercultural experiences. Interracial, interethnic, and international communication problems and principles were examined at both the interpersonal and mass levels. Perceptual, nonverbal and verbal issues were addressed.

Students were encouraged to attend class, so as not to miss the various group discussions and decision-making sessions. Discussion groups were chosen to be racially and ethnically mixed to provide maximal diversity of inputs for intercultural discussion. In conversation with the instructors, students reported surprise at the differences and certain similarities fellow undergraduates brought with them to the course. Christian students were made aware of the unique values and beliefs their Jewish friends held; students with an Oriental heritage shared the knowledge of their special customs; Black students gained first-hand knowledge of their White friends' attitudes and beliefs.

Another requirement of the course was a term paper on an intercultural communication topic of the student's choice, and an oral presentation of the paper. Once again, this oral presentation was intended to promote the sharing of ideas and knowledge among the students.

An external experiential activity was also required of each student. All were required to establish an intercultural relationship outside of class with a member of a different culture. Many students were able to locate individuals from another country through a university program. Each student kept a diary of the communication interactions with their new friend, and was required to hand in three diary entries and an analysis of their communication experiences.

A fourth requirement for the course was a multiple choice type examination. While traditional testing techniques measure knowledge gain, they ignore the sensitization effect which was sought in this seminar. To that end, an evaluative (in a non-prescriptive sense) questionnaire was administered to the class at three points in time. This questionnaire measured agreement with a number of knowledge, attitudinal and behavioral items dealing with cultural issues, and asked the student if he/she had friends or acquaintances from a number of cultural groups. The questionnaire itself is Appendix A at the end of this section.

As in-class data collections were conducted at three separate times -- during the second week of the term, the middle of the term (fifth or sixth week), and the final (tenth) week -- comparisons were made across the three sets of data. Table 1 shows the mean agreement scores (on a seven-point scale with 7=strongly agree and 1=strongly disagree) for the ten statements at three points in time, and the results of an analysis of variance, repeated measures,

for each set of mean scores. Only those cases which contributed data at all three points in time are included in this analysis.

(Table 1 about here)

Four knowledge-type items were included in the questionnaire: "If you know the language of a different culture, communicating with members of that culture should be as easy as communicating with members of your own culture," "The United States is composed of many different cultures," "Members of different cultures perceive objects and persons in the same basic manner," and "Nonverbal behaviors are quite universal." The course content was supportive of the second statement, and contradictory to the remaining three. An examination of Table 1 shows that only two of the four items showed agreement score shifts in the desired direction: slightly greater agreement was gained for the statement that the United States is composed of many different cultures, and disagreement increased for the statement that nonverbal behaviors are quite universal. These changes are at near-significant levels. While the remaining two statements showed greater agreement over time when greater disagreement was predicted, these changes were not significant, and consonant explanations are possible. For example, the students may have responded to the statement, "If you know the language of a different culture, communicating with members of that culture should be as easy as communicating with members of your own culture," in light of their own increased understanding of various cultural groups.

Three attitudinal items were included in the questionnaire: "Americans are in general intellectually superior to other cultures," "Policies promoting female/male equality should be enforced in all cultures," and "Developing

nations should utilize more U.S. mass media content in order to help in their development." The emphasis of the seminar was such as to reduce agreement with all three attitude items. Increased disagreement, although nonsignificant, was found in the cases of the first and third statements. The second statement retained a mean neutral rating across all three waves. This is not particularly surprising, since this statement concerning male/female equality presents a fairly complex issue, involving more than culturally-based attitudes.

Three items measuring reported behavior were included in the agree-disagree portion of the questionnaire: "I am willing to share personal concerns with members of any culture," "I have friends from many different cultures," and "I usually look for the opportunity to know members of different cultures." The course aims were to increase all of these behaviors. The second and third statements did show increased agreement across time at near-significant levels. The first statement, however, gained a nonsignificant decrease in agreement. A congruent explanation is possible, however: Less willingness to share personal concerns with members of any culture may be a result of greater awareness of cross-cultural differences and possible intercultural communication problems.

One additional set of behavioral measures was included in the questionnaire. Students were asked to endorse all cultural groups in which they had friends or acquaintances. Table 2 shows the various cultural groupings listed in the questionnaire and the percentages endorsing those groups for the first and the third waves of data collection. While some changes seem surprising (e.g. declines for U.S. Blacks and U.S. Caucasians), they may actually be a result of changing ideas and definitions of cultural groupings

on the part of the students. The students may have engaged in labeling differentially across time. Further studies are encouraged to address this issue.

(Table 2 about here)

Further analyses of these data might give a more exact picture of how knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors relate to one another and change in an intercultural education situation. Perusal of a Pearson correlation matrix of all variables at three points in time reveals a number of highly significant correlations between measures at time 1 and measures at time 3 (the ultimate dependent variables in a model of intercultural education evaluation research).

Table 3 shows a number of interesting correlational relationships. Agreement at time 3 with the statement "If you know the language of a different culture, communicating with members of that culture should be as easy as communicating with members of your own culture" (indicated in Table 3 as LANG) is positively related to agreement at time 1 with the statement "I am willing to share personal concerns with members of any culture" (SHARE) ($r=-.41$), and negatively related to agreement at time 1 with the statement "The U.S. is composed of many different cultures" (US) ($r=-.42$).

The table reveals that the correlation between LANG and US at time 1 as well as the correlation between LANG and US at time 3 are both fairly small and are nonsignificant. This indicates that a belief at time 1 that the U.S. is composed of many cultures is related to a later (time 3) belief that language skills are not sufficient for understanding a culture, but that these two beliefs are not related at the same point in time. Likewise, the

correlation between LANG and SHARE at time 1 and the correlation between LANG and SHARE at time 3 are smaller than the time 3/time 1 correlation. In this case, the correlation between the two items increases from time 1 to time 3, indicating a growing relationship between the willingness to share personal concerns interculturally and the belief that language skills are sufficient for intercultural communication.

Agreement with the statement "Members of different cultures perceive objects and persons in the same basic manner" (PERCEIV) at time 3 is found to be positively correlated with agreement with two different time 1 statements: "If you know the language..." (LANG) (r=.42) and "Non-verbal behaviors are quite universal" (NONVER) (r=.40).

Again, examination of time 1 only and time 3 only intercorrelations shows a growing relationship between the variables: More and more, the belief that perceptions are culturally universal is related to the belief that language skills are sufficient for effective intercultural communication and to the belief that non-verbal behaviors are universal. Conversely, one may say that the relationship between the belief that perceptions are not universal and the belief that language skills are not sufficient for intercultural communication grows stronger over time as the course progresses.

Agreement with the statement that non-verbal behaviors are universal (NONVER) at time 3 is negatively related to agreement at time 1 with the idea the "The U.S. is composed of many different cultures" (US) (r=-.42). Time 1 only and time 3 only correlations are very small; an across-time relationship is shown. Those who entered the class believing in a multi-culture U.S. tended to leave the class disagreeing with the idea that non-verbal behaviors are universal.

Feelings of national superiority seem to be negatively related to intercultural friendship activities. Agreement with the statement at time 1 that "I have friends from many different cultures" (FRIEND) is negatively correlated with agreement at time 3 that "Americans are in general intellectually superior to other cultures" (SUPER) (r=-.40). Likewise agreement at time 1 that Americans are intellectually superior (SUPER) is negatively correlated with agreement at time 3 that one has friends from many cultures (FRIEND) (r=-.46).

Time 1 only and time 3 only correlations show a growing but nonsignificant negative relationship between the two variables at a given point in time. There exists a sort of reciprocal across-item relationship: Those students who entered the class having friends from different cultures tended to leave the class disagreeing with the idea that Americans are intellectually superior, and those who entered the class feeling that Americans are intellectually superior tended to leave the class having comparatively few intercultural friends.

It must be kept in mind when examining these correlational findings that they are selected for illustrative purposes. No effort was made to control for autocorrelation; these findings should be seen as indicative of needs for further research emphasis.

We have seen from these basic analyses that there is some reason to believe that attitudes and behaviors as well as knowledge may be affected by intercultural education. We have also seen that some relationships may exist between the beliefs and attitudes a student brings to the classroom experience and certain beliefs and attitudes that the student holds as an outcome of the course. That is, we have reason to believe that the course content may interact with antecedent attributes of the students in forming outcome know-

ledge, attitudes, and behaviors. Finally, we have seen that the course content may influence the way in which intercultural knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors interrelate, as shown by changes in correlations over time. Whether such changes are indeed a result solely or mainly of the educational experience is a question which needs to be further examined in more rigorous research of this kind.

Several cautions must be forwarded: Our small sample size and lack of random sampling or assignment preclude generalizable results, so that this must be viewed as an exercise in attempting evaluation research. Self-selection to the course did occur, thus possibly biasing the sample by including mostly those individuals predisposed favorably to intercultural communication. This might either mean that the class was overly predisposed to change, or perhaps less capable of change in that their attitudes/behaviors were already congruent with the course content! Studies utilizing classes which are required for a given student body are encouraged to examine these possibilities.

While these cautions must be seriously considered, it is important to recognize the value of such evaluation attempts. Using an evaluation procedure as described herein gives one an indication of which attitudes and behaviors do not change, which do change and to what degree these changes occur. It allows us to take stated objectives of a classroom experience and evaluate to what degree these objectives have been met. Most importantly, it lets one examine rather than guess at the attitudinal and behavioral results of the intercultural communication education experience.

References

Barnett, G. A. and McPhail, L. An Examination of the Relationship United States Television and Canadian Identity. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. Vol. 4, No. 2, 1980, pp. 219-232.

Cross, K. "Where the Learners Are." The New Jersey Adult Educator. Spring, 1980.

Etheridge, A. "Conceptual Approach to Teaching/Learning" in Materials and Methods in Continuing Education. Klevins, Chester ed. Los Angeles: Klevens Publications, Inc., 1976.

Fulbright, J. "We're Tongue-tied." Newsweek. July 30, 1979, p. 15.

Gagne, M. and Briggs, J. Principles of Instructional Design. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.

Griffis, B. A. "Cross-Cultural issues in the Process of Sending U.S. Employees of Multinational Corporations for Overseas Service: Theoretical Considerations with Practical Implications." ERIC, ED 177655, November 1979.

Hall, E. T. Beyond Culture. Graden City, N. Y.: Anchor Books, 1977.

Knowles, S. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. New York: Association Press, 1970.

Kohls, R. and Ax, E. Methodologies for Trainers: A compendium of Learning Strategies. Washington: Futurenics, Inc., 1979.

Prosser, M. H. The Cultural Dialogue. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Sarbaugh, L. E. Intercultural Communication. Rochelle Park, N. J.: Hayden, 1979.

Smelser, N. J. The Theory of Collective Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1963.

Table 1

Mean Agreement Scores over Three Waves and
Results of Analysis of Variance, Repeated Measures

(7=strongly agree, 1=strongly disagree)
(N=22 for all 3 waves)

		Wave I	Wave II	Wave III	Sig. of F
1.	If you know the language of a different culture, communicating with members of that culture should be as easy as communicating with members of your own culture.	2.9	3.3	3.2	.61
2.	The United States is composed of many different cultures.	6.0	6.4	6.3	.05
3.	Members of different cultures perceive objects and persons in the same basic manner.	2.4	2.7	2.7	.66
4.	Non-verbal behaviors are quite universal.	3.7	2.7	2.8	.07
5.	I am willing to share personal concerns with members of any culture.	4.7	4.7	4.2	.27
6.	Americans are in general intellectually superior to other cultures.	2.7	2.1	2.2	.13
7.	Policies promoting female/male equality should be enforced in all cultures.	3.9	4.0	3.9	.81
8.	Developing nations should utilize more U.S. mass media content in order to help in their development.	3.3	3.2	3.1	.91
9.	I have friends from many different cultures.	3.9	4.1	4.7	.06
10.	I usually look for the opportunity to know members of different cultures.	4.4	4.2	4.7	.14

Table 2

Percent Reporting Friends/Acquaintances of
Various Cultural Groups, at First and Final Times
(N=22)

"Among my friends and acquaintances there are:

	Wave I	Wave III
Mexican-Americans (U.S.)	59%	68%
Blacks (U.S.)	95	91
Caucasians (U.S.)	100	91
Other U.S. minorities	23	36
Europeans	45	41
Asians (Orientals)	41	41
Africans	18	18
Latin Americans	27	23
Other Foreign Nationals"	5	5

Table 3

Selected Correlations

Time 3 Measures x Time 1 Measures			Both at Time 1	Both at Time 3
LANG	x US	-.42*	-.16	-.05
	X SHARE	.41*	.26	.35*
PERCEIV	x LANG	.42*	.24	.49**
	NONVER	.40*	.29*	.47**
NONVER	x US	-.42*	-.05	.04
SUPER	x FRIEND	-.40*	-.00	-.24
FRIEND	x SUPER	-.46*	-.00	-.24

All numerical values in the above table are Pearson correlation coefficients.

* - $p<.05$
** - $p<.01$

Appendix A

CLASS STUDENT #_____ INTERCULTURAL ATTITUDES, KNOWLEDGE & BEHAVIOR WAVE 3

This questionnaire is designed to assess your attitudes, knowledge and behaviors regarding certain issues of importance in intercultural communication. Please answer this questionnaire as quickly as possible and be very honest. No grades are assigned to this exercise and nobody will know what you answered as an individual. We will report to you, in class, the results of the survey for the aggregate and no mention will be made of individual responses.

Please tell us your degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements: (circle one number for each statement)

	STRONGLY AGREE						STRONGLY DISAGREE
1. If you know the language of a different culture, communicating with members of that culture should be as easy as communicating with members of your own culture.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2. The United States is composed of many different cultures.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
3. Members of different cultures perceive objects and persons in the same basic manner.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
4. Non-verbal behaviors are quite universal.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
5. I am willing to share personal concerns with members of any culture.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
6. Americans are in general intellectually superior to other cultures.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
7. Policies promoting female/male equality should be enforced in all cultures.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
8. Developing nations should utilize more U.S. mass media content in order to help in their development.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
9. I have friends from many different cultures.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
10. I usually look for the opportunity to know members of different cultures.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

11. Among my friends and acquaintances there are (check all that apply):

Mexican-Americans (U.S.)_____ Europeans_____

Blacks (U.S.)_____ Asians (Orientals)_____

Caucasians (U.S.)_____ Africans_____

Other U.S. minorities_____ Latin Americans_____

Other Foreign Nationals_____

12. Are you a female_____ or a male_____?

13. Are you Caucasian_____ Black_____ Mexican-American_____ Oriental_____

Other